



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/941,105	08/28/2001	John F. Buford	01-8001	5844
32127	7590	03/08/2004	EXAMINER	
VERIZON CORPORATE SERVICES GROUP INC. C/O CHRISTIAN R. ANDERSEN 600 HIDDEN RIDGE DRIVE MAILCODE HQEO3H14 IRVING, TX 75038			VEILLARD, JACQUES	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2175	6
DATE MAILED: 03/08/2004				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/941,105	BUFORD ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jacques Veillard	2175	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 August 2001.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 27-52 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 27-52 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to the Applicant's communication filed on 8/28/2001.
2. Claims 1-26 have been canceled and claims 27-52 have been added.
3. Claims 27-52 are pending and presented for examination.

Priority

4. Applicant's claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. 119(e) of the U. S provisional application 60/291,148 filed on 5/15/2001 is acknowledged. ***Drawings***
5. The drawings replacements were received on 1/15/2002. These drawings are acknowledged and approved by the draftsperson under 37 CFR 1.84 or 1.152.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the

reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

7. Claims 27, 35-37, 45, 46, 51 and 52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Miloslavsky et al. (U. S. Pat. No. 6,581,105, hereinafter Miloslavsky).

As per claims 27 and 37, Miloslavsky discloses a method for improving e-mail routing in an Internet protocol network (See title and abstract). Similarly, the method comprising the steps of: retrieving an email message (complaint) from a user (complainant) about an incident over the computer network (See Fig.23 and corresponding text, col.39, 30-32, and col.40, lines 8-11); parsing the complaint into a plurality of component (See Fig.22 component 6206 and col.36, lines 66-67); normalizing one of the Plurality of components (See Fig.22 components 6210 and 6214 and corresponding text namely col.37, lines 23-35 “Miloslavsky uses a formatted and deformatted process to normalize the email components”); and using an analysis protocol on the one of the plurality of components to extract information relating to the complaint (See Fig.22 component 6204 in conjunction element 6208 and corresponding text).

As per claims 46 and 51, the claims have substantially the same limitation as claims 27 and 37. These limitations have already been addressed in the rejection of claims 27 and 37. Therefore, they are rejected on similar ground corresponding to the arguments given for the rejected claims above.

As per claims 35 and 45, Miloslavsky discloses the claimed invention, wherein the extracted information comprises one of a complaint tracking code, such as a URL that enables computers all over the world to access it (See col.11, lines 17-27 and col.12, lines 15-20).

As per claim 36, Miloslavsky discloses the claimed invention, wherein the extracted information forms a record of a database (See col.2, lines 12-22, lines 35-38, and col.41, lines 30-42).

As per claim 47, Miloslavsky discloses the claimed invention, wherein the analysis protocol further includes an extractor adapted to isolate specific information in the message in accordance with predetermined criteria (See Abstract lines 4-10, and col.2, lines 19-22).

As per claim 48, Miloslavsky discloses the claimed invention, wherein the extractor searches for at least one of an IP address, a domain name, and an electronic mail address (See col.2, lines 42-45).

As per claim 52, Miloslavsky discloses the claimed invention, wherein one of the specific fields comprises a source IP address (See col.38, lines 49-53).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2175

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 28-34, 38-44, 49 and 50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miloslavsky et al. (U. S. Pat. No. 6,581,105, hereinafter Miloslavsky) in view of Donaldson (U. S. Pat. No. 6,321,267).

As per claims 28 and 38, Miloslavsky teaches a method contains a parser (See Fig.22, component 6206). Miloslavsky does not teach, wherein the parsing steps further includes locating a header in one of the plurality of components.

Donaldson teaches a method for filtering junk mail (See the Title and the abstract lines 1-2) including the feature of locating a header in one of the plurality of components (See col.4, lines 4-7, and lines 25-26).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time Applicant's invention was made to modify the teachings of Miloslavsky with the teachings of Donaldson because Donaldson provides a method wherein the header message can be located in order to reject email from unknown hosts that do not list the recipient's email address header of the message.

As per claim 29, the combination of Miloslavsky and Donaldson, as modified, teaches the claimed invention, further including the step of locating a header keyword in the header (See Donaldson's col.4, lines 28-31).

As per claims 30 and 39, the combination of Miloslavsky and Donaldson, as modified, teaches the claimed invention, wherein the normalizing step includes removing, at least one character from the header based on the header keyword (See Donaldson's col.2, lines 38-41).

As per claims 31 and 40, the combination of Miloslavsky and Donaldson, as modified, teaches the claimed invention, further including the step of locating a Received line in one of the plurality of components (See Donaldson's col.2, lines 49-61, and col.3, lines 5-14).

As per claims 32 and 41, the combination of Miloslavsky and Donaldson, as modified, teaches the claimed invention, further including the step of validating a source IP address from the Received line (See Donaldson's col.4, lines 53-61).

As per claims 33, 42 and 43, the combination of Miloslavsky and Donaldson, as modified, teaches the claimed invention, wherein the source IP address is validated by locating one or more delimiters in the Received line (See Donaldson's Fig.3, col.3, lines 39-41 and col.4, lines 15-21).

As per claims 34 and 44, the combination of Miloslavsky and Donaldson, as modified, teaches the claimed invention, further including the step of categorizing the complaint into a category (See Donaldson's col.7, lines 31-64).

As per claim 49, the combination of Miloslavsky and Donaldson, as modified, teaches the claimed invention, wherein the extractor identifies an alphanumeric character associated with the IP address, the domain name or the electronic mail address (See Donaldson's Figs.3 and 4 and corresponding text).

As per claim 50, the combination of Miloslavsky and Donaldson, as modified, teaches the claimed invention, wherein the message components include a header and body (See Donaldson's Fig.3, and col.4, lines 28-30).

Other Prior Art Made of Record

10. Paul	U. S. Pat. No. 5,999,932,
Shaw et al.	U. S. Pat. No. 6,249,807,
Pang	U. S. Pat. No. 6,167,434,
Greenstein	U. S. Pat. No. 6,266,692, and
McCormick	U. S. Pat. No. 6,421,709.

Conclusion

11. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

12. **Any response to this action should be mail to:**

Commissioner of Patent and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231

Or faxed to:

(703) 746-7239 (for formal communication intended for entry)

Or:

(703) 746-7240 (for informal or draft communications, please label
"PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Hand - delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2021 Crystal Drive, Arlington.

VA, Fourth Floor Lobby (Receptionist Telephone No. (703) 305-3900).

13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jacques Veillard whose telephone number is (703) 305-7094. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Friday from 9:30 AM to 4: 30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dov Popovici, can be reached on (703) 305-3830. The fax phone number for this group is (703) 308-5403.

Charles Rones
CHARLES RONES
PRIMARY EXAMINER

JV
Jacques Veillard
Patent Examiner TC 2100

March 2, 2004